

Exhibit 300: Capital Asset Plan and Business Case Summary

Part I: Summary Information And Justification (All Capital Assets)

Section A: Overview

1. **Date of Submission:** 2011-02-22

2. **Agency:** 007

3. **Bureau:** 97

4. **Name of this Investment:** Virtual Interactive Processing System

5. **Unique Project (Investment) Identifier (UPI):** 007-97-01-03-01-3855-00

6. **What kind of investment will this be in FY 2012?:** Mixed Life Cycle

- Planning
- Full Acquisition
- Operations and Maintenance
- Mixed Life Cycle
- Multi-Agency Collaboration

7. **What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB?** FY2010

8.

- a. **Provide a brief summary of the investment and justification, including a brief description of how this closes in part or in whole an identified agency performance gap, specific accomplishments expected by the budget year and the related benefit to the mission, and the primary beneficiary(ies) of the investment.**

The Virtual Interactive Processing System (VIPS) will modernize and automate the Information Technology (IT) capabilities for qualifying Applicants into the Military Service during wartime, peacetime, and mobilization. VIPS will enable a responsive, flexible and efficient means to qualify Applicants to meet manpower resource requirements for the uniformed Services, Coast Guard, and National Guard routine and contingency operations. VIPS is the future accessioning system for use by the US Military Entrance Processing Command (USMEPCOM). USMEPCOM serves as the single entry point for determining the physical, aptitude, and conduct qualifications of candidates for enlistment. VIPS will provide the capability to electronically acquire, process, store, secure, and seamlessly share personnel data across the Accessions Community of Interest (ACOI). When fully implemented, VIPS will reduce the cycle time required to induct enlistees to meet the needs of Homeland Defense, reduce the number of visits to the Military Entrance Processing Stations (MEPS), reduce manual data entry errors, and reduce attrition through better pre-screening practices. The implementation of a Modular Open System Architecture (MOSA) approach will enable accession data to be securely available to applicants and ACOI partners such as Recruiting and Training Commands, Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC), Military Health System, Human Resource Management (HRM), and Defense Travel Management Office (DTMO). VIPS will support compliance with Department of Defense (DoD) direction for a net-centric environment and take advantage of automated data capture technology, e.g., medical equipment with the capability to capture and electronically transmit exam results. VIPS will be location independent, virtually paper-free, and automated to assist with bringing the right people at the right time to operational commanders. VIPS is scheduled to replace USMEPCOM's applicant processing portion of the legacy system, USMEPCOM Integrated Resource System (USMIRS) in FY 2012. In addition, VIPS Increment 1.0 will complete deployment activities, achieve Full Operational Capability (FOC) and transition into sustainment in FY 2012. The development of VIPS Increment 2.0 development will begin based on finalized requirements and related completion of related acquisition activities. The VIPS Program will be baselined following Preliminary Design Review at Milestone B.

- b. **Provide any links to relevant websites that would be useful to gain additional information on the**

investment including links to GAO and IG reports.

Title	Link
NONE	

9.

a. Provide the date of the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approval of this investment.

2005-01-05

b. Provide the date of the most recent or planned approved project charter. 2005-01-05

10. Contact information?

a. Program/Project Manager Name: *

Phone Number: *

Email: *

b. Business Function Owner Name (i.e. Executive Agent or Investment Owner): COL Larry Larimer

Phone Number: *

Email: *

11. What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (choose only one per FAC-P/PM or DAWIA): Project manager assigned to investment, but does not meet requirements according to FAC-P/PM or DAWIA criteria.

- Project manager has been validated according to FAC-P/PM or DAWIA criteria as qualified for this investment.
- Project manager qualifications according to FAC-P/PM or DAWIA criteria is under review for this investment.
- Project manager assigned to investment, but does not meet requirements according to FAC-P/PM or DAWIA criteria.
- Project manager assigned but qualification status review has not yet started.
- No project manager has yet been assigned to this investment.

Section B: Summary of Funding (Budget Authority for Capital Assets)

1.

Table I.B.1: Summary of Funding
(In millions of dollars)

(Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)

	PY-1 and earlier	PY 2010	CY 2011 (CY Continuing Resolution)	BY 2012	BY+1 2013	BY+2 2014	BY+3 2015	BY+4 and beyond	Total
Planning:	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Acquisition:	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Planning & Acquisition Government FTE Costs	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition(DME):	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Operations & Maintenance:	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Disposition Costs (optional):	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Operations, Maintenance, Disposition Government FTE Costs	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Subtotal O&M and Disposition Costs (SS):	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
TOTAL FTE Costs	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
TOTAL (not including FTE costs):	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
TOTAL (including FTE costs):	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Number of FTE represented by	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

Table I.B.1: Summary of Funding
(In millions of dollars)

(Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)

	PY-1 and earlier	PY 2010	CY 2011 (CY Continuing Resolution)	BY 2012	BY+1 2013	BY+2 2014	BY+3 2015	BY+4 and beyond	Total
Costs:									

2. Insert the number of years covered in the column “PY-1 and earlier”:

3. Insert the number of years covered in the column “BY+4 and beyond”: *

4. If the summary of funding has changed from the FY 2011 President’s Budget request, briefly explain those changes:

*

Section C: Acquisition/Contract Strategy (All Capital Assets)

1.

Table I.C.1 Contracts Table

Contract Status	Contracting Agency ID	Procurement Instrument Identifier (PIID)	Indefinite Delivery Vehicle (IDV) Reference ID	Solicitation ID	Alternative financing	EVM Required	Ultimate Contract Value (M)	Type of Contract/Task Order (Pricing)	Is the contract a Performance Based Service Acquisition (PBSA)?	Effective date	Actual or expected End Date of Contract/Task Order	Extent Completed	Short description of acquisition
Awarded		0013	FA701406A0015		*	*	\$343,380.0	Labor Hours	Y	2010-02-03	2011-02-02	Y	A&AS Labor
Awarded		0197	W912HZ09D0003	W912HZ09R0008	*	*	\$425,926.0	Fixed Price with Economic Price Adjustment	X	2010-04-16	2011-04-15	N	U434ISC DBSAE for Business Reengineering
Awarded		3A02	W91QUZ09D0023		*	*	\$3,893,285.8	Time and Materials	Y	2010-01-01	2012-12-31	Y	VIPS PROGRAM SUPPORT
Awarded		3A02	W91QUZ08D0018		*	*	\$4,664,722.0	Time and Materials	Y	2010-01-13	2013-01-12	Y	Engineering and Test Support for the Virtual Interactive Processing System PMO.
Awarded		HQ056610P0029		HQ056610T0029	*	*	\$96,124.0	Firm Fixed Price	Y	2010-08-27	2011-02-15	Y	Earned Value Management Training W/Insight Professional

Table I.C.1 Contracts Table

Contract Status	Contracting Agency ID	Procurement Instrument Identifier (PIID)	Indefinite Delivery Vehicle (IDV) Reference ID	Solicitation ID	Alternative financing	EVM Required	Ultimate Contract Value (M)	Type of Contract/Task Order (Pricing)	Is the contract a Performance Based Service Acquisition (PBSA)?	Effective date	Actual or expected End Date of Contract/Task Order	Extent Completed	Short description of acquisition
and Dashboard													
Awarded		W91QUZ10C0067		W91QUZ10R0003	*	*	\$79,209,755.4	Cost Plus Incentive	Y	2010-09-30	2014-02-28	Y	Base Year-ROC Implementation

2. If earned value is not required or will not be a contract requirement for any of the contracts or task orders above, explain why:

*

3.

- a. Has an Acquisition Plan been developed? If yes, please answer the questions that follow *
- b. Does the Acquisition Plan reflect the requirements of FAR Subpart 7.1 *
- c. Was the Acquisition Plan approved in accordance with agency requirements *
- d. If "yes," enter the date of approval? *
- e. Is the acquisition plan consistent with your agency Strategic Sustainability Performance Plan? *
- f. Does the acquisition plan meet the requirements of EOs 13423 and 13514? *
- g. If an Acquisition Plan has not been developed, provide a brief explanation.

*

Part II: IT Capital Investments

Section A: General

1.
 - a. Confirm that the IT Program/Project manager has the following competencies: configuration management, data management, information management, information resources strategy and planning, information systems/network security, IT architecture, IT performance assessment, infrastructure design, systems integration, systems life cycle, technology awareness, and capital planning and investment control. yes
 - b. If not, confirm that the PM has a development plan to achieve competencies either by direct experience or education.
2. Describe the progress of evaluating cloud computing alternatives for service delivery to support this investment. VIPS solution leverages a virtualized environment in a managed service provider facility. It was selected based upon an assessment of alternative service providers considering the following factors: technical performance, schedule and cost.
3. Provide the date of the most recent or planned Quality Assurance Plan 2010-09-30
4.
 - a. Provide the UPI of all other investments that have a significant dependency on the successful implementation of this investment.
 - b. If this investment is significantly dependent on the successful implementation of another investment(s), please provide the UPI(s).
5. An Alternatives Analysis must be conducted for all Major Investments with Planning and Acquisition (DME) activities and evaluate the costs and benefits of at least three alternatives and the status quo. The details of the analysis must be available to OMB upon request. Provide the date of the most recent or planned alternatives analysis for this investment. 2010-12-17
6. Risks must be actively managed throughout the lifecycle of the investment. The Risk Management Plan and risk register must be available to OMB upon request. Provide the date that the risk register was last updated. 2010-11-09

Section B: Cost and Schedule Performance

Table II.B.1. Comparison of Actual Work Completed and Actual Costs to Current Approved Baseline:

Description of Activity	DME or SS	Agency EA Transition Plan Milestone Identifier	Planned Cost (\$M)	Actual Cost (\$M)	Planned Start Date	Actual Start Date	Planned Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Planned Percent Complete	Actual Percent Complete
Final Request for Proposal (RFP) for the System Developer released to the Industry. Baseline has not been approved at this time.		*	\$0.3	\$0.1	2009-07-10	2009-07-10	2009-12-23	2010-04-20	100.00%	100.00%
Technology Development Phase (Milestone B) Approval - developing acquisition planning documentation and technical demonstrations to provide a road map of future system capabilities. Baseline has not been approved at this time.	DME	*	\$33.3	\$27.3	2010-04-21	2010-04-21	2011-04-04		82.00%	82.00%
Engineering and Manufacturing Development to Full Operational Capability-developo p/integrate Increment 1.0. Required capabilities delivered and sustainment activities initiated.	DME	*	\$35.9	\$0.0	2011-04-05		2012-04-15		0.00%	0.00%

Table II.B.1. Comparison of Actual Work Completed and Actual Costs to Current Approved Baseline:

Description of Activity	DME or SS	Agency EA Transition Plan Milestone Identifier	Planned Cost (\$M)	Actual Cost (\$M)	Planned Start Date	Actual Start Date	Planned Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Planned Percent Complete	Actual Percent Complete
Planned costs based on approved budget. Baseline not approved at this time										
Development of Increment 2.0 - enhance Increment 1.0 business functions and establish a 100% digital applicant medical record to support enlistment. Planned costs based on approved budget. Baseline not approved at this time.	DME	*	*	*	2012-01-01	*	2012-09-30	*	*	*
Sustainment of VIPS Increment 1.0 - support materiel readiness and operational performance requirements and sustain Increment 1.0. Overlaps with development of Increment 2.0. Planned costs based on approved budget. Baseline not approved at this time.	SS	*	*	*	2013-04-16	*	2014-04-15	*	*	*

Table II.B.1. Comparison of Actual Work Completed and Actual Costs to Current Approved Baseline:

Description of Activity	DME or SS	Agency EA Transition Plan Milestone Identifier	Planned Cost (\$M)	Actual Cost (\$M)	Planned Start Date	Actual Start Date	Planned Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Planned Percent Complete	Actual Percent Complete
Sustainment of VIPS Increment 1.0 - support materiel readiness and operational performance requirements and sustain Increment 1.0. Overlaps with development of Increment 2.0. Planned costs based on approved budget. Baseline not approved at this time.	SS	*	*	*	2012-04-16	*	2013-04-15	*	*	*

2. If the investment cost, schedule, or performance variances are not within 10 percent of the current baseline, provide a complete analysis of the reasons for the variances, the corrective actions to be taken, and the most likely estimate at completion. N/A

3. For mixed lifecycle or operations and maintenance investments an Operational Analysis must be performed annually. Operational analysis may identify the need to redesign or modify an asset by identifying previously undetected faults in design, construction, or installation/integration, highlighting whether actual operation and maintenance costs vary significantly from budgeted costs, or documenting that the asset is failing to meet program requirements. The details of the analysis must be available to OMB upon request. Insert the date of the most recent or planned operational analysis.

4. Did the Operational analysis cover all 4 areas of analysis: Customer Results, Strategic and Business Results, Financial Performance, and Innovation?

Section C: Financial Management Systems

Table II.C.1: Financial Management Systems			
System(s) Name	System acronym	Type of Financial System	BY Funding
*	*	*	*

Section D: Multi-Agency Collaboration Oversight (For Multi-Agency Collaborations only)

Table II.D.1. Customer Table:	
Customer Agency	Joint exhibit approval date
NONE	

Table II.D.2. Shared Service Providers		
Shared Service Provider (Agency)	Shared Service Asset Title	Shared Service Provider Exhibit 53 UPI (BY 2011)
*	*	*

Table II.D.3. For IT Investments, Partner Funding Strategies (\$millions):							
Partner Agency	Partner exhibit 53 UPI (BY 2012)	CY Monetary Contribution	CY “In-Kind” Contribution	CY Fee-for-Service	BY Monetary Contribution	BY “In-Kind” Contribution	BY Fee-for-Service
NONE							

Table II.D.4. Legacy Systems Being Replaced		
Name of the Legacy Investment of Systems	Current UPI	Date of the System Retirement
*	*	*

Section E: Performance Information

Table I.E.1a. Performance Metric Attributes

Measurement Area (For IT Assets)	Measurement Grouping (For IT Assets)	Measurement Indicator	Reporting Frequency	Unit of Measure	Performance Measure Direction	Baseline	Year Baseline Established for this measure (Origination Date)
Customer Results	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Customer Benefit	quarterly	MEPS Visits per Accession	The following enterprise accession metrics, between MEPCOM and the VIPS PMO, have been identified as the indicators to determine the successful implementation of the VIPS solution. However, changes may occur to these preliminary metrics.	2.6 visits per accession	2010-09-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2009	This investment was included in the legacy system, MIRS submission in FY 2009.	1 visit per accession	Not Due	2010-09-20
			2010	1 visit per accession	Limited Operations in FY 2012.	Not Due	2011-02-21
Customer Results	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Customer Benefit	quarterly	MEPS Visits per Accession	The following enterprise accession metrics, between MEPCOM and the VIPS PMO, have been identified as the indicators to determine the successful implementation of the VIPS solution. However, changes may occur to these preliminary metrics.	2.6 visits per accession	2010-09-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated

Customer Results	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Customer Benefit					
			2010	TBD	1 visit per accession	Not Due	2010-09-20
			2011	1 visit per accession	Limited Operations in FY 2012.	Not Due	2011-02-21
			quarterly	MEPS Visits per Accession	The following enterprise accession metrics, between MEPCOM and the VIPS PMO, have been identified as the indicators to determine the successful implementation of the VIPS solution. However, changes may occur to these preliminary metrics.	2.6 visits per accession	2010-09-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2011	TBD	1 visit per accession	Not Due	2010-09-20
Customer Results	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Customer Benefit	2012	1 visit per accession	TBD	Not Due	2011-02-21
			quarterly	MEPS Visits per Accession	The following enterprise accession metrics, between MEPCOM and the VIPS PMO, have been identified as the indicators to determine the successful implementation of the VIPS solution. However, changes may occur to these preliminary metrics.	2.6 visits per accession	2010-09-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated

			2012	TBD	1 visit per accession	Not Due	2010-09-20
			2013	1 visit per accession	TBD	Not Due	2011-02-21
Customer Results	Accuracy of Service or Product Delivered	Customer Benefit	quarterly	MEPS Visits per Accession	The following enterprise accession metrics, between MEPCOM and the VIPS PMO, have been identified as the indicators to determine the successful implementation of the VIPS solution. However, changes may occur to these preliminary metrics.	2.6 visits per accession	2010-09-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2013	TBD	1 visit per accession	Not Due	2010-09-20
			2014	1 visit per accession	TBD	Not Due	2011-02-21
Processes and Activities	Cycle Time	Cycle Time and Timeliness	quarterly	Average Applicant time Spent at a MEPS Per Visit	The following enterprise accession metrics, between MEPCOM and the VIPS PMO, have been identified as the indicators to determine the successful implementation of the VIPS solution. However, changes may occur to these preliminary metrics.	6 hours	2010-09-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2009	This investment was included in the legacy system, MIRS	4 hours	Not Due	2010-09-20

			submission in FY 2009.				
Processes and Activities	Cycle Time	Cycle Time and Timeliness	2010	4 hours	Limited Operations in FY 2012.	Not Due	2011-02-21
			quarterly	Average Applicant time spent at a MEPS per visit	The following enterprise accession metrics, between MEPCOM and the VIPS PMO, have been identified as the indicators to determine the successful implementation of the VIPS solution. However, changes may occur to these preliminary metrics.	6 hours	2010-09-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target “Met” or “Not Met”	Last Updated
			2010	TBD	4 hours	Not Due	2010-09-20
			2011	4 hours	Limited Operations in FY 2012.	Not Due	2011-02-21
Processes and Activities	Cycle Time	Cycle Time and Timeliness	quarterly	Average Applicant time spent at a MEPS per Visit	The following enterprise accession metrics, between MEPCOM and the VIPS PMO, have been identified as the indicators to determine the successful implementation of the VIPS solution. However, changes may occur to these preliminary metrics.	6 hours	2010-09-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target “Met” or “Not Met”	Last Updated
			2011	TBD	4 hours	Not Due	2010-09-20
			2012	4 hours	TBD	Not Due	2011-02-21

Processes and Activities	Cycle Time	Cycle Time and Timeliness					
			quarterly	Average Applicant time spent at a MEPS per visit	The following enterprise accession metrics, between MEPCOM and the VIPS PMO, have been identified as the indicators to determine the successful implementation of the VIPS solution. However, changes may occur to these preliminary metrics.	6 hours	2010-09-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target “Met” or “Not Met”	Last Updated
			2012	TBD	4 hours	Not Due	2010-09-20
			2013	4 hours	TBD	Not Due	2011-02-21
Processes and Activities	Cycle Time	Cycle Time and Timeliness	quarterly	Average Applicant time spent at a MEPS per Visit	The following enterprise accession metrics, between MEPCOM and the VIPS PMO, have been identified as the indicators to determine the successful implementation of the VIPS solution. However, changes may occur to these preliminary metrics.	6 hours	2010-09-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target “Met” or “Not Met”	Last Updated
			2013	TBD	4 hours	Not Due	2010-09-20
			2014	4 hours	TBD	Not Due	2011-02-21

Page 18 / 22 of Section300 OMB Circular No. A11 (2010)

			indicators to determine the successful implementation of the VIPS solution. However, changes may occur to these preliminary metrics.				
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2011	TBD	1.9	Not Due	2010-09-20
			2013	1.9	TBD	Not Due	2011-02-21
Mission and Business Results	Operational Defense	Effectiveness	quarterly	Applicant to Accession Ratio	The following enterprise accession metrics, between MEPCOM and the VIPS PMO, have been identified as the indicators to determine the successful implementation of the VIPS solution. However, changes may occur to these preliminary metrics.	2.9	2010-09-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2012	1.9	TBD	Not Due	2011-02-21
Mission and Business Results	Operational Defense	Effectiveness	quarterly	Applicant to Accession Ratio	The following enterprise accession metrics, between MEPCOM and the VIPS PMO, have been identified as the indicators to determine the successful implementation of the VIPS solution. However, changes may occur to these preliminary metrics.	2.9	2010-09-01

			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2013	TBD	1.9	Not Due	2010-09-20
			2014	1.9	TBD	Not Due	2011-02-21
Technology	Availability	Information and Data	quarterly	Processing and Data Error Reduction (for specified data elements)	The following enterprise accession metrics, between MEPCOM and the VIPS PMO, have been identified as the indicators to determine the successful implementation of the VIPS solution. However, changes may occur to these preliminary metrics.	37%	2010-09-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2009	This investment was included in the legacy system, MIRS submission in FY 2009.	3%	Not Due	2010-09-20
			2010	3%	Limited Operations in FY 2012.	Not Due	2011-02-21
Technology	Availability	Information and Data	quarterly	Processing and Data Error Reduction (for specified data elements)	The following enterprise accession metrics, between MEPCOM and the VIPS PMO, have been identified as the indicators to determine the successful implementation of the VIPS solution. However, changes may occur to these preliminary metrics.	37%	2010-09-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated

			2010	TBD	3%	Not Due	2010-09-20
			2011	3%	Limited Operations in FY 2012.	Not Due	2011-02-21
Technology	Availability	Information and Data	quarterly	Processing and Data Error Reduction (for specified data elements)	The following enterprise accession metrics, between MEPCOM and the VIPS PMO, have been identified as the indicators to determine the successful implementation of the VIPS solution. However, changes may occur to these preliminary metrics.	37%	2010-09-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2011	TBD	3%	Not Due	2010-09-20
			2012	3%	TBD	Not Due	2011-02-21
Technology	Availability	Information and Data	quarterly	Processing and Data Error Reduction (for specified data elements)	The following enterprise accession metrics, between MEPCOM and the VIPS PMO, have been identified as the indicators to determine the successful implementation of the VIPS solution. However, changes may occur to these preliminary metrics.	37%	2010-09-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated

			2012	TBD	3%	Not Due	2010-09-20
			2013	3%	TBD	Not Due	2011-02-21
Technology	Availability	Information and Data	quarterly	Processing and Data Error Reduction (for specified data elements)	The following enterprise accession metrics, between MEPCOM and the VIPS PMO, have been identified as the indicators to determine the successful implementation of the VIPS solution. However, changes may occur to these preliminary metrics.	37%	2010-09-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2013	TBD	3%	Not Due	2010-09-20
			2014	3%	TBD	Not Due	2011-02-21

* - Indicates data is redacted.